

**BEFORE THE MISSISSIPPI REAL ESTATE APPRAISER
LICENSING AND CERTIFICATION BOARD**

**MISSISSIPPI REAL ESTATE APPRAISER
LICENSING AND CERTIFICATION BOARD**

COMPLAINANT

VS.

CASE NO.: 26-1709

**MICHAEL T. ALLEN, APPRAISER,
LICENSE NO: RA-1005**

RESPONDENT

CONSENT ORDER

This matter came before the Mississippi Real Estate Appraiser Licensing and Certification Board (sometimes hereinafter "Board) for entry of a Consent Order regarding the Respondent, Michael T. Allen, License No. RA-1005 (sometimes hereinafter "Respondent" or "Allen"). This action is before the Board as the result of Respondent's appraisal of real property located at 228 Trace Drive, Pearl, Mississippi 39208. By entering into this Consent Order, Respondent Allen waives his right to a hearing with full due process and the right to appeal any adverse decision resulting from that hearing. Having reached an agreement by consent in this matter, the Board issues its Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Disciplinary Order as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACT

I.

The Mississippi Real Estate Appraiser Licensing and Certification Board is charged by law with the regulation of the practice of real estate appraisal including matters relating to real estate appraiser standards, qualifications and licensing, and

disciplinary functions pursuant to §§73-34-1, *et seq.*, Miss. Code Ann. (1972), as amended. The Board, pursuant to this authority, has full, complete and proper jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter herein.

II.

Respondent Michael T. Allen is an adult resident of Mississippi whose last known address of record with the Board is 33 Trystan Drive, Petal, Mississippi 39465. Respondent is the holder of a real estate appraiser's license, No. RA-1005, issued by the Board pursuant to Miss. Code Ann. §§73-34-1, *et seq.*, as amended, and, as such, he is subject to all of the provisions, rules, regulations and statutes governing the appraisal of real property and licensing of real estate appraisers under Mississippi law.

III.

On or about July 8, 2017, Respondent Allen performed an appraisal of property located at 228 Trace Drive, Pearl, Rankin County, Mississippi 39208, and issued an Appraisal Report.

IV.

Respondent did not provide verified documentation or analysis in the work file for certain information stated in the referenced Appraisal Report. The work file contains very limited verified documentation. No cost approach documentation is contained in the work file to show cost approach analysis or conclusions. There is no apparent explanation for the difference in market value concluded (\$45,000) vs. the concluded value for the cost approach (\$86,880), an unexplained \$41,880 difference in the two values for the respective approaches. There was no verified documentation reflecting

the analysis upon which the appraiser concluded site value.

V.

Identified errors in the Appraisal Report included, but were not limited to the following:

- In Addendum, Respondent stated “Carport/garages at \$1500 per stall” but Respondent made a \$5,000 adjustment when the adjustment apparently should have been concluded at only \$3,000;
- In Addendum, adjustments for bedrooms were reflected as \$2,000, bathrooms at \$1,000, and half bathrooms at \$500 but each comparable analyzed had the same number of bedrooms as the subject so therefore no adjustment warranted;
- In Addendum, adjustments as described for screened porches, decks, fireplaces, fences and sheds along with barns are not reflected on the sales comparison approach of the Appraisal Report;
- In Addendum, Respondent stated “age adjustments are not made in lieu of any condition adjustments.” However, no adjustments were made in either section of the Appraisal Report;
- It is unclear where did Respondent obtained the square footage information when no tax records could be located in the work file;
- Due to exterior-only inspection, appraiser claimed extraordinary assumption, but failed to disclose or explain the assumption.

VI.

Respondent did not follow the requirements specified in the “Client Order Request.” Order Request required Respondent to physically visit each comparable and take original photos of the exterior of each. Respondent stated in the Appraisal Report he did personally take each photo, but they do appear to be MLS photos. Respondent should have taken a different angle to prove that he physically visited the comparables.